

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration of this patent application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments, and the following remarks. Claims 1-8 are in the application. Claims 1, 7 and 8 have been amended. Claim 9 has been added.

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for the reasons set forth on page 2 of the Office Action. In response, Applicant hereby amends claims 1, 7 and 8, and provides new claim 9. Claim 9 includes elements cancelled from original claim 1. It is respectfully submitted that all currently pending claims fully comply with 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection on this basis be withdrawn.

Claims are 1-3 and 5-7 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over *Blattry* in view of *Curlett*. Essentially, the Examiner's position was that *Blattry* discloses the hydraulic stabilizing device recited in the claims except for features which are said to be disclosed in *Curlett*. The Examiner asserts, referring to Fig. 1c of *Blattry*, that it would have been obvious

to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide the second pressure sensor of a first embodiment of *Blattry* in a second embodiment of *Blattry* having the switching device. Additionally, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the piston art to interchange the switching apparatuses of *Blattry* and *Curlett*.

These rejections are respectfully traversed.

As set forth in claim 1, the invention relates to a hydraulic stabilization device for vehicles. In contrast to Applicant's invention, neither *Blattry* nor *Curlett* refer to such a device. Moreover, *Blattry* refers to a "double-acting compressed air operable clamping cylinder piston system for rotatable working spindles of machine tools" (column 1, lines 12-14), which is not analogous to the present invention of providing a stabilization device without any loss of safety (See page 2, second full paragraph of the specification). One skilled in the art would thus not look to *Blattry* to solve the problems faced by prior stabilizing devices.

Even if one skilled in the art were to make the hypothetical combination suggested by the Examiner, one still would not arrive at Applicant's invention. The present invention discloses a switching device (17) and a switching apparatus (18) comprising two separate switching valves arranged in parallel with one another, which is a critical feature of the invention. This feature is neither disclosed nor suggested in either *Blattray* or *Curlett*.

Contrary to Examiner's assertions, *Curlett* does not disclose a control valve which could be used as switching apparatus (18) having two separate switching valves arranged in parallel. *Curlett* discloses a 4/3 control valve arrangement with two plungers arranged in series with one another (and not in parallel). Both plungers have to work together to achieve the correct switching function of the valve and if one of the plungers fails the valve cannot work properly. For example, the pressure fluid to actuate the ram 41 flows according to Fig. 2 from inlet 31 over the line 35 to groove 27a and via groove 26a to port 39. Port 39 can only be put under pressure if the fluid passes through both of the bores 2 and 3. Thus, a series arrangement of plungers is provided in *Curlett*. Another example

of the series arrangement is the neutral position according to Fig. 1: the inlet 31 is connected to groove 25a via the line 33 and in this position to the outlet 32. This connection between inlet 31 and outlet 32 is a connection in series of both bores 2 and 3.

Finally, *Curlett* does not disclose that one of the plungers has a blocking and a direct pass-through position whereas the other plunger has a blocking and a crossed-over passed-through position. Thus, substituting the switching apparatus of *Blattry* with that of *Curlett* would not lead to the present invention, as neither reference teaches switching devices arranged in parallel.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-3 and 5-7 are patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and this case be passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,
Norbert KOCH ET AL

COLLARD & ROE, P.C.
1077 Northern Boulevard
Roslyn, New York 11576
(516) 365-9802

Elizabeth C. Richter, Reg.No.35,103
Attorneys for Applicants

ECR : DG : cmm

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on November 14, 2007.

Amy Klein
Amy Klein